REMARKS

Claims 15, 16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-41, and 43-52 are currently pending, wherein claims 15, 20, 25, 33, 34, 43, and 44 have been amended and claims 17, 23, 27, 42, and 53-57 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 1 of the Office action ("Action"), the Examiner rejects claims 23, 42, and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants hereby cancel claims 23, 42, and 55-58, rendering this rejection moot.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 33-53 and 55-57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 01/48678 A1 to Anoto AB ("Anoto"). Claims 42, 53, and 55-57 have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot with regard thereto. Regarding, claims 33-41 and 43-52, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 33-41 and 43-52 are not anticipated by Anoto because Anoto fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Independent claim 33 defines a method, in a computer system, of identifying an application in the computer system to receive information from a drawing device which is configured to detect position data in a position-coding pattern. The method includes, *inter alia*, receiving incoming position data from the drawing device; deriving, based upon said incoming position data, a service identifier; and identifying, based upon said service identifier, at least one

MKM/PLC/vd

application in the computer system, wherein the service identifier identifies an activity a user wishes to perform.

In rejecting claim 33, the Examiner points to page 15 of Anoto as disclosing a service identifier as claimed. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that Anoto teaches "the coordinates within a certain region are allocated a program file for that region, therefore there must be some identifier within the coordinates (position data) that identifies the application used for those coordinates." The Examiner's assertion is unfounded for the following reason.

The Examiner appears to be asserting that Anoto inherently discloses a service identifier as claimed in as much as Anoto discloses that a region of a position-coding pattern may be assigned/allocated a program file. However, a service identifier does not inherently, i.e., necessarily, flow out of the disclosure of Anoto. Independent claim 33 recites that a service provider is derived from the received position data, and is used to identify at least one application in the computer system. The disclosure of Anoto relied on by the Examiner merely discloses that a program file may be associated with parts or regions of the position-coding pattern. Although an identifier may be used, it is not required, as a 1:1 association could be made between the position coordinates and the program file, without including an identifier. Furthermore, even if, *arguendo*, Anoto did inherently disclose an identifier it is not inherent that the identifier be a *service* identifier as claimed, (i.e., an identifier that identifies an activity a user wishes to perform). Accordingly, independent claim 33 is not anticipated by Anoto.

Independent claims 43 and 44 define a computer program product and device, respectively, for identifying an application in a computer system to receive information from a drawing device. The computer program and device both include deriving, based upon incoming

MKM/PLC/vd

position data, a service identifier and identifying at least one application in the computer system based on the service identifier, wherein the service identifier identifies an activity a user wishes to perform. Accordingly, independent claims 43 and 44 are patentable over Anoto for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 33.

Claims 34-41 and 45-52 variously depend from independent claims 33 and 44. Therefore, claims 34-41 and 45-52 are patentable over Anoto for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 33 and 44. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 33-41 and 43-52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In paragraph 5 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 15-18 and 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anoto in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 06096383 A to Yoshida ("Yoshida"). Claims 17, 23, and 27 have been canceled rendering this rejection moot with regard thereto. Regarding claims 15, 16, 18, 24-26, and 28, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three criteria must be met. First, there must be some motivation to combine the cited references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combination must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 15, 16, 18, 24-26, and 28 are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Anoto and Yoshida for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

Independent claim 15 defines a method, in a computer system, of transferring information from a drawing device, which is aligned to detect position data on a base by means of a position-coding pattern, which constitutes part of an abstract position-coding pattern, to an application in the computer system. The method, as amended, includes, *inter alia*, storing in a memory of the computer system position data coming from the drawing device; extracting from said position data a page identifier identifying to which page or pages in the abstract position-coding pattern the position data belongs; determining, based on a location of said position data in the abstract position-coding pattern or the page identifier, which applications in the computer system are registered to utilize received data; and transferring said position data from the memory to at least one of said applications.

Since Anoto and Yoshida both fail to disclose or suggest extracting from the position data a page identifier identifying to which page or pages in the abstract position-coding pattern the position data belongs, the combination of these two references cannot possibly disclose or suggest said element. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Anoto and Yoshida, the combination would still fail to render claim 15 unpatentable because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Independent claims 24 and 25 define a computer program and device, respectively, for transferring, in a computer system, information from a drawing device to an application in the computer system. The computer program and device both include storing in a memory of the computer system position data coming from the drawing device; extracting from the position data a page identifier identifying to which page or pages in the abstract position-coding pattern the position data belongs; and transferring the position data from the memory to at least one of

MKM/PLC/vd

the registered applications. Accordingly, independent claims 24 and 25 are patentable over the combination of Anoto and Yoshida for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element. See discussion above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 16, 18, and 26-28 variously depend from independent claims 15 and 25. Therefore, claims 16, 18, and 26-28 are patentable over the combination of Anoto and Yoshida for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 15, 23, and 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 16, 18, 24-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Penny Caudle (Reg. No. 46,607) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _Penny Caudle Reg #46,607_
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

MKM/PLC/vd